4/6/71

Dear Howard,

Your mailing of 4, with 2 ltrs 3, plus clips. Re clips: I haven't time for all that Chou Mein but will welcome anything really significant that you would anticipate the Post didn't have. I have to narrow, not broaden. Bishop quote: exactly what I wanted. I found my own note but haven't the slightest idea who borrowed the book. Your citation is identical with that of my note, so I know it is what I sought. I have this written including Manchester and the Burkley 11/27 memo. I want to add Bishop. You'll see and understand (I hope) why.

I neither can nor will take the time for full response to your well-intentioned long letter, and I do appreciate the time you took. But I think instead of me rereading what you wrote (especially since you said precisely that all over again, with but a slight change in pitch), it is you who should do some rehtinking with the maturity that is very rapidly coming to you. You should, with your exceptional intelligence and sensitivity, have by this time come to the realization that you have a dual life, one as a cloistered young man drinking up the formalities of the experiences of life called advanced education and the other as a man coping with some of the grimmer realities of real life. You can't switch contexts between the two. What is of the essence in the former, particulrly with the emphasis on grading and conformity, can often be crippling in the latter. Counterproductive, too. There are great variations in approaches, personalities, concepts of time and priorities, of roles, objectives and many other things. Although most tell me I am some kind of philosopher, I do not think so and I haven't the time to sit and ponder. There is too much that has little chance of ever getting done if I do not do it. Therefore, and I'd welcome any reasonable dispute on this, my primary objective is to do as much as I can, and when I have lived at the pace I have, with the multitudinous problems I have and will have and have passed 58, I have to consider that there is much less time left for me than, let me say, for you. You should have some understanding of the pace at which I go, even if when you are here I seem relaxed. Since the Gessell decision, in addition to all the other things I have doen, as with the "threat" and making a full analysis of the government's case against Garrison and what I am certain is involved and what I think may be, keeping up an extensive correspondence with others with whom I work, making detailed analyses of assorted numbered and unnumbered CDs sent me for this purpose, taking a full hour each a.m. for a hard walk, etc., I have also written most of PMIII, about 25,000 words. Perforce, I have had to do this with relativelt little consultation with my files. Where I wanted to quote precisely, I have stopped and found. Where I am not certain, or where addition of something simple, like dates, may be all, I've just written. Or, I get things done. This is, has been and will be my top priority. There are factors involved lost upon you. I have to consider them. For example, I have to be read for my suit for the damages to us from helicopters, for the appeal in the clothing/pix suit, and even for the possibility of a break of some kind there. I note also I have much to do on the Ray business and have kept it up to date. So, one of the things I am telling you is that the standrads of your life are not and can't be those of mine. I can't take two years to write a book, as most writers do, when I can do it in a month.

In addition, I have to live with the relaities of publishing, which are better know to me that to you and than you realize. One is that every publisher expects to edit. Another is that no two agree on editing. If the book is otherwise good, editing is not any kind of serious problem. Where I have asked for it, it has not been provided, as promised (I & II). Where I gave carte blanche (O in NO), it was terrible. Where I interposed no objection in return for speed, and didn't get that, as with F-U, it was in some cases terrible and in most cases resulted in verbosities, redundancies and endless repetition of the unnecessary. Most of those parenthetical insertions in the first aprt are in the editing. It did have to be

c_ntracted, but all that drek did not have to be inserted. The greatest reality is a reluctance to publish, and that is one that may in rare cases be coped with.

Standards of what is good writing are as variable as sta dards of beauty. There are certain aspects on which there is pretty uniform agreement, such as clarity. Some of the things that a few of my friends like least are those of which I get laudatory comments from professional editors. Besides, all those working in a field tend to perfer their opinions expressed the way they would express them and on this basis alone are critical of what others are not.

My style is uniquely my own. It is different. You may not like it. Cook doesn't. He couldn't and justify his own, so he has little choice. No let me give you a current specific example. You were unimpressed by what you read of AO, and two others of your peer group have had adverse comment about the writing. But two professional editors in a major house are excited by it. One is a total stranger. I have never even spoken to him. Can you both (sides) be right? Yes, with writing, remember de gustibus.

On focus: if you've read the two previous parts of PM and have to ask that, what can I say? Are you assuming that it will cahnge? Is there any doubt about that? So much of what will have to come out of I is in for this purpose, in part. You have been taught that things have to be kept simple. For business writing, for themes, to make things easy for profs, for instructions, law suits and all sorts of things this is fine and true. But when deals with a subject as enormous and complicates as this, limit to one focus is dishonest, inaccurate and incomplete. Little parenthetical insertions, while they may offend the sterile concepts of taught writing, do help give fullness and understanding. There is room for disagreement here, but this is my view. You do it your way. I am prepared for your disapproval of the introduction to my Burkley chapter, but I liked it and I read it to an editor, who thinks it great, and he understands the harmonics your ear may not detect. The one thing I will not do is alter what I want to say for acceptability. In all my writing I try to include what I consider relevant to the entire story and to the particular thing about which I am at any point writing.

In any event, if I am to get the writing done, I can't begin to try and develop new concepts of writing and a new style while I am writing. That is a job to be done if and when needed by editing, some by me and if there is commercial publishing, by a professional editor (to tell you what is worse about F-U, there were two). And, Lil does go over everything before she retypes it. We then go over her suggestions, most of which are incorporated.

is

There xx something else I am doing in all this writing, and that is telling the story of our work, to the degree I can, and this entails a telling of some of the problems attendant upon it. I am also telling the story of a personal investigation, not something I got in a library, and the "how" I think does add to understanding. I think it can't be called indulging ego. Besides, the current preference is for first-erson accounts, I am reliably told by the people who buy the stuff for publishers. One side comment before having to stop without finishing: If it is not my fight with the government for the stuff I'm using, please tell me who the hell's it is? Please tell me who was willing to undertake in this area what I did? Why should I not make a record of it where all sorts of irresponsible retreads have always appered (as JG and Lane) and are (Bud and Cook)? How else leave a record of what did happen? How without it will anyone in the future be able to evaluate conflicting versions of the same thing, or simply evaluate claims, as with JG and the whole CTIA shcmatta. I do not anticipate using anything of yours. If on reading I find I have, I'll ask. Remember, I also asked you not to use any of my medical stuff. Hurriedly,